

Town of Lincoln

100 Old River Road, Lincoln RI

Zoning Board of Review

February 6, 2007 Minutes

Present: Raymond Arsenault, Kristen Rao, Gabriella Halmi, Arthur Russo, Jr., Jina Karempetsos, David Gobeille, John Bart, Town Solicitor Mark Krieger

Miscellaneous

Chairman Arsenault congratulated Member Russo for being re-appointed for a two-year term and welcomed new member, John Bart, as an alternate member to the Zoning Board.

Minutes

Motion made by Member Karempetsos to accept the January 2007 minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Member Gobeille. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Correspondence

None

Applications:

Superb Builders, Inc., 6 Red Brook Crossing, Lincoln, RI –

Dimensional Variance for rear yard setback for the construction of a pool house on property located at 6 Pine Tree Lane, Lincoln, RI.

AP 26, Lot 275 Zoned: RA 40

Town Solicitor Mark Krieger recused himself from this application as the owner is a client of his. John Gannon, Esquire sat as Board Advisor.

Chairman read into the record standards that need to be met for a Dimensional Variance.

Represented by: Richard Kirby, Esquire, 72 Pine Street, Providence, RI (Represents Owner and Builder)

Property is owned by Tarek Wehbe, 5 Princess Pine Road, Lincoln, RI who contracted Superb to construct a home. Applicant is seeking relief for an accessory structure. The contract with builder included an addendum for the construction of a 500 sq.ft. pool house at the rear of the property. When the town inspected the property they noticed an in ground pool had been installed without a permit. The clubhouse sits nine feet from the property line and is over 500 sq.ft.

Witness:

Harry Zervas, President Superb Builders

Superb Builders is licensed in Rhode Island and builds custom homes. Superb was employed by owner in the Fall of 2004 to build a two story Mediterranean style house and 500 sq.ft. pool house. He

did not work with the architect and the house plans were provided by the owner. The plans showed a 500 sq.ft pool house. The permit was pulled at the beginning of 2005 and work started on the pool house in August/September 2005. Foundation work was also started in August/September 2005. A footing was poured and an excavation inspection was conducted for the residence and pool house followed with a foundation inspection in September 2005. Submitted into the record Building Inspection Form with initials HBT dated 9/20/05 as Exhibit #1 and building permit for in ground pool dated 6/22/06 signed by Henri Thibaudeau, Building Official as Exhibit #2. The in ground pool was inspected by Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official at which time builder was told there was a problem with the in ground pool and pool house and a stop work order was issued on both (Exhibit #3). Builder continued to grade the property and installed columns on the pool house after a stop order had been issued. Attorney submitted into the record four photos of the pool house taken at the time of the pool inspection (Exhibit #4) and three photos of the pool house area showing the grading and columns (Exhibit #5).

When the existing pool house was built contractor thought the in ground pool and pool house were included in the permit. Electrical and plumbing permits were pulled separately. The house is 6,500 sq.ft with a circular driveway in front. The house sits back fifty feet and is within the building envelope with a three car garage to the right of the house. The best spot for the 20' by 40' kidney shaped pool is at the rear of the property and the pool house is ten feet from the

edge of the pool. There is no other spot for the pool house because of the unique shape of the lot.

Chairman asked the attorney if applicant was seeking 66 foot relief and attorney replied “yes”. The code requirement is that anything in excess of 500 sq. ft requires it to meet that setback requirement. It is 9 feet from the property line and applicant needs 75 feet because they are seeking relief from the property line. Chairman asked if the site plans were drawn to scale and attorney replied “yes”. Chairman asked what the distance was from the house to the pool. Witness replied there is a deck at the rear of the house and approximately 8 feet from the house to the pool and 10 feet between the pool and cabana. Topography has a slight pitch.

Witness stated he did not build a 500 sq.ft. pool house because the plans were incorrect and that is why it is 92 feet over what is allowed by zoning. Member Rao addressed witness about the deck at the rear of the house – the deck was not on the plans and what were the dimensions. Witness replied he did not know the dimensions and did not have any plans with him. She stated that the plans before her showed 73 feet from the edge of the house to the property line. Witness replied it was a typographical error and should read 75 feet. She further asked witness what was so unique about the lot and how wide was the house. Witness replied the house is about 84 feet wide from the bump out plus or minus a couple of feet.

Chairman stated that neither of the two submitted site plans was stamped by a surveyor. Member Russo asked if the cabana was depicted on the original plans and witness replied "no". Chairman stated that the permit pulled in December 2004 did not reflect a pool or pool house. Witness replied at that time he had not been contracted to build the pool or pool house and intended to pull a permit later. Member Halmi stated if they reduced the size of the pool house by 92 feet they would not need to be before the Board. Witness stated they thought they were building a 500 sq. foot pool house. Witness replied it would be too difficult to reduce the size of the pool house because construction was complete. Plumbing is already installed with concrete columns on the front. Member Halmi stated that the applicant cannot create their own hardship even though it was a mistake on his part. Attorney replied he thought of creating their own hardship and go before the Zoning Board with no building permit issued and no application for a variance. The pool house is 92 sq. ft. in excess of what the ordinance allows. If applicant was before this Board without having the mistake of it being built without a permit or in excess of square footage, the evidence would establish that this relief is the least relief necessary because a 75 foot setback is rather high and it is the proper placement for it in relation to the pool and the house. It is unfortunate applicant is before this Board and the pool house was built at 592 sq.ft.

Witness

James M. Sloan IV, Sloan Real Estate, Inc., 15 Cutler Street, Warren, RI

Submitted his resume into the record as Exhibit #6. Mr. Sloan has testified before this Board in the past as a licensed real estate appraiser. Motion made by Member Rao to accept Mr. Sloan as an expert witness. Motion seconded by Member Halmi. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Witness conducted a survey at the site, prepared a summary, inspected and viewed the property and reviewed the Town of Lincoln Comprehensive Plan. Witness prepared a real estate summary which was submitted into the record as Exhibit #7. His research indicates what applicant is asking for is the least relief necessary for this size structure. This is not an uncommon event and applicant made an honest mistake. The granting of the requested relief would not have an adverse effect on other properties in the area and a smaller cabana would not fit the site. The amount of relief requested is such that there is not much of a difference in the impact of the subject property and surrounding property. Member Rao asked what part of the comprehensive plan fits in and witness replied the house is in a residential RA 40 zone.

Chairman Arsenault read into the record the Planning Board recommendation:

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. During the site visit, the TRC discovered that the pool house was already built. The Zoning Official noted that the building was built without a building permit and zoning relief and therefore was built illegally. The Planning Board recommends Denial of the application for a dimensional variance. The Planning Board feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a dimensional variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the Board feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The development of the existing residential house and pool house began on a vacant lot. Before building began, the applicant had opportunities to design and locate their proposed structures within the set zoning setbacks. The Planning Board feels that the applicant has sufficient room on the property to locate a pool house without having to request a variance. The Planning Board feels that the dimensional variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Town Witness

Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official

On November 1, 2004 the applicant pulled a permit signed by Henri C. Thibaudeau, Building Official to construct a single family home. During a routine electrical inspection on June 20, 2006 it was noticed

that an in ground pool and cabana was being constructed without permits and a stop work order was issued. The pool permit was pulled after construction of the pool had already begun. It was noted at that inspection that the cabana was in excess of 500 sq.ft and a violation notice was also issued. The roof on the cabana is considered part of the structure and included in the 592 sq.ft. measurement. The original site plan (submitted into the record as Town's Exhibit #1) shows the in ground pool and some type of building (no dimensions listed) and that the house is in conformance. The house sits 75 feet from the rear property line but the application shows it at 73 feet. This Board needs to determine if the house falls into conformance because of the discrepancy. The drawings accepted by the Town were not stamped for the main house structure. The builder has constructed other homes in the area and submitted into the record as Town's Exhibit #2 spreadsheet listing addresses of homes they have constructed for which he pulled permits separately for pools and pool houses. Attorney Gannon stated the spreadsheet was pertinent. He replied he could not recall the exact testimony of Mr. Zervas but if he had indicated he had done this before then it may be relevant. Being a licensed contractor it is something he should have done. Whether or not the Board accepts the document is up to the Board. Attorney for applicant objected to the introduction of the spreadsheet stipulating his client should have pulled a permit for this particular structure. His testimony was not along the lines that there was an error with the building permit it as always his intention to build a 500 sq.ft. building. Chairman stated he

would accept the spreadsheet and place it on file.

Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official addressed the Board stating his argument was that the Town needs to encompass the entire footprint including the roof area and calculate the entire area of the building. This building goes beyond the one foot soffit area of a home allowed in the ordinance and would set a bad precedent because a building permit was not sought and not given guidance as to the location of the pool house. The site itself does not have any unique characteristics – it is a 40,000 sq.ft. lot and the house does fill in most of the footprint as testified to. It is his opinion that this would set a dangerous precedent for contractors to make the mistake of building an oversized building and come before the Board with a zoning issue.

In Favor

Gary & Charleen Gosselin, 7 Pine Tree Lane, Lincoln, RI

They live across the street and have no objection to the location of the cabana. Feels it adds value to the neighborhood.

In closing, Attorney Kirby stated applicant should have pulled permits and if the plans had been properly drawn they would not be before the Board. What owner is asking for is the least relief they can seek and acted in good faith. There were some mistakes made by the town and the applicant. When applicant originally applied for the house permit the plans were appropriately drawn to show the pool house dimensions they would not be here. Testimony is clear that the

location of the pool house and pool happened after they stopped the process with the home which led to the problem of the construction of the pool house and getting the footings inspected. This applicant understand that they should have pulled a permit and not an instance where someone is trying to build as big as they can get. Mr. Hervieux said that it would create a bad precedent which is important. This particular instance, the unique circumstances that the house was being built with a contract to build a 500 sq.ft pool house. Builder relied on the homeowner submitted architectural drawings with and there was a deviation from being 16 feet wide in depth to 18.5 feet which made the pool house 592 sq.ft. Builder built the footings then had an inspection and was not told there was a problem. Applicant is facing the issue of a pool house that has been built larger than the allowed footprint and this is the least relief available. This applicant acted in good faith. Applicant called for an inspection and was not trying to hide anything.

Motion made by Member Halmi to deny the application stating:

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structures.
- The hardship is the result of prior actions of the applicant.
- The granting of this variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and impair the intent and purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance and the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.
- The relief requested is not the least relief necessary.
- The hardship may amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Motion to deny seconded by Member Gobeille.

Discussion:

Member Russo agreed with comments made by Member Halmi. Applicant is not asking for a few feet but almost 200 feet of relief with the overhang. Member Halmi stated it will be difficult to repair the problem but the builder is experienced and testified to his mistake regarding square footage of the pool house. Builder has testified that it was his mistake and it is between him and the owner to work this out. Member Rao indicated the Planning Board recommendation was to deny the application and she feels the variance will alter the general area and impair the intent. Member Karempetsos stated she did not see any evidence of bad faith on the part of the applicant and the Town admitted to mistakes as well. There are mitigating circumstances that she has not seen any evidence presented of bad faith. All the inspections were requested. If the Board requires this builder and owner to endure a hardship of demolishing the structure at great expense due to what appears to be an honest mistake. The precedent issue could be cleared by specifically stating facts that are relevant circumstances of this case if other cases come up in the future where inspections are not requested. This is a serious mistake that puts the Board in an awkward position. She believed it would fit the criteria for a dimensional variance. Chairman addressed the

Board that this was a vacant lot with no pre-existing situation preventing it from being built according to our code and weighed the Planning Board recommendation.

Motion to deny carried with a 4-1 vote with members Halmi, Rao, Gobeille and Arsenault voting aye and Member Karempetsos voting nay.

Rita M. Caraccia, 393 Great Road, Lincoln, RI – Use Variance for two additional apartments for a total of six units on property located at 1431 Smithfield Avenue, Lincoln, RI.

AP 9, Lot 130 Zoned: RL 9

Applicant asked that her application be continued to the April agenda. Motion made by Member Karempetsos to continue the application to the April 3, 2007 agenda. Motion seconded by Member Halmi. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Patti Hien, 65 Grandview Avenue, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for lot width relief, front and side yard setback relief for the subdivision of property located at 65 Grandview Avenue, Lincoln, RI.

AP 8, Lot 23 Zoned: RS 12

Chairman read into the record standards that need to be met for a Dimensional Variance. Member Gobeille recused himself and Member Russo sat with full privileges.

Represented by: Paul Rampone, PE, The Hart Companies, 29 Sylvia Lane, Lincoln, RI

The existing lot is 38,000 sq.ft. with 600 feet of frontage on Grandview and Arcadia and another 93.7 linear feet on Lakeview. Applicant wants to subdivide a 38,000 sq.ft. lot into two lots: one 26,800 sq.ft lot and the new lot would be 12,000 sq.ft. lot. There are other 7,000 to 15,000 sq.ft. lots in the area. Originally, this area was made up of 15 separate lots. Presently there are 6 lots because original owners purchased multiple lots and combined them into single lots. This particular lot combined 4.5 lots into one creating a corner lot and a thru lot. Applicant is seeking relief of 6.3 feet of lot width relief and rear setback on the garage from the rear property line is for 29 foot variance. Front setback from the back pool house on Grandview and Arcadia is for 14 foot front yard relief and the southwest corner is 9 feet. The garage side yard setback request is for 27.5 feet. Attorney Krieger suggested applicant also needs lot coverage relief of 1.4%. Mr. Rampone asked that the application be amended to request lot coverage relief. Motion made by Member Rao allowing applicant to amend her application to include lot coverage relief of 1.4%. Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Applicant believes this lot is unique in that it was 4.5 lots which were converted into one lot. This lot is not the result of any action of the applicant and will not alter the general characteristics of the neighborhood. Creating one lot is the least relief necessary to

achieve applicant's goal. The benefit of this variance is allowing the applicant to remain in her home.

Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendation:

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The proposed dimensional variances are to clear up the pre-existing nonconformance of this parcel of land. This lot and existing buildings were platted and developed before present day zoning regulations. Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Planning Board recommends Approval of this application. The Planning Board finds that the relief requested will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.

In Favor:

Ellen Keeler, 41 Lakeview Road, Lincoln

She does not feel the requested relief would change the neighborhood.

Opposed:

David Wyatt, 50 Lakeview Road, Lincoln, RI

He is an abutter of the property. What are plans for the lot – is a house lot being created? Chairman replied plans for the subdivision

were submitted to the Planning Board for the creation of a house lot. The footprint for a house on the new lot is 240 sq.ft or 20% of the area which means if a house is built it would be very small. There is also quite a bit of ledge in the area and he is concerned about flooding. He submitted two petitions signed by local residents who object to the application and feel it would not be good for the neighborhood (submitted as Exhibit #1). Attorney Krieger reviewed the signatures and noted there were duplicate signatures and the petitions were not notarized. He informed the Board it can accept these petitions and give them whatever weight it deems necessary. One petition requested the Board deny the application and another petition was a request to continue the application and afford abutters an opportunity to retain counsel. He was out of town when he received notice and needs additional time to consult with an attorney. Chairman replied that a public notice was placed on the website, posted in town hall and advertised in the Providence Journal. Chairman asked Mr. Wyatt that he commented that a 12,000 sq. ft. lot would have a small house in the footprint and would not fit into the neighborhood. There are small homes in the area that fit into the neighborhood. Mr. Wyatt replied whoever purchase this lot would have to come before this Board and ask for a variance if they could not build a house in the footprint. Attorney Krieger addressed Mr. Wyatt and explained that lot coverage means the total square footage of building cannot exceed 20% of the square footage of the lot and in this case they could not exceed 2,466 sq.ft, which is a large house.

Opposed:

Paula Andrews, 101 Woodland Street, Lincoln, RI

She has lived in the area for 25 years and is concerned about parking.

Residents use the area as a cut through to Carriage Heights and run a stop sign at the corner.

Motion made by Member Russo to approve the Dimensional application for the following relief:

- 6.3 foot width relief for parcel #2**
- 1.4% lot coverage relief for parcel #1**
- 14 foot front setback from pool house at the northwest corner**
- 4 foot shed setback**
- 27.5 foot setback from the east side of the garage**
- 29 foot setback from the north side of the garage**
- 26.5 foot setback on the north side of the pool house**

Member Russo further stated:

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln**

Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.

- **The relief requested is the least relief necessary.**
- **The hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of the property**

Motion seconded by Member Rao. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Anthony Marchetti, 10 Morning Star Court, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Relief seeking rear yard relief for the construction of an addition.

AP 26, Lot 238 Zoned: RA 40

Member Russo sat with full privileges. Chairman Arsenault read into the record standards that need to be met for a Dimensional Variance.

This application was continued from the January agenda so applicant could return with more accurate plans. House is 2,980 sq.ft. and is only 25 feet deep. Applicant cannot use the kitchen as a family eat in area because it is too small and wants to expand. Lot is wide and tapers across the front. Rear of the property slopes and proposed location of addition is best. Nearest structure at the rear is approximately 1,000 feet away.

Witness

David Garneau, 1 DuCarl Drive, Lincoln, RI

He is the developer for the project and originally built the house. Problem with the lot is it is shallow in depth and the house sits within the building envelope. Kitchen is 11 feet deep and the dinette area has a hallway leading to a door. The dimensions of the dinette area is 7 feet by 9 feet. Showed Board pictures of the lot on the right side which shows the location of the dinette. Relocating the dinette would need to remove the kitchen and fireplace and move the plumbing which would cause a financial hardship to the applicant. Air conditioning condensers outside would also need to be moved.

Chairman read into the record Planning Board recommendation:

This application was continued by the Zoning Board in order for the applicant to supply the Board with additional information. According to the Zoning Official, no new information or plans were submitted. Therefore, the TRC and the Planning Board could not render a new recommendation. The existing recommendation is as follows: Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Planning Board recommends Denial of the application for a dimensional variance. The Planning Board feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a dimensional variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the Board feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The Board feels that the applicant has sufficient room to the side of the property to locate an addition without having to request a variance.

The Planning Board feels that the dimensional variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Motion made by Member Halmi to approve a 15.8 foot rear yard setback stating:

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.**
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.**
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.**
- The relief requested is the least relief necessary.**
- The hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of the property**

Motion seconded by Member Karempetsos. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Town of Lincoln, 100 Old River Road, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance seeking light pole height relief for school and athletic fields

located at 152 Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI.

AP 26, Lots 38/39/41/43 Zoned: RA 40

Represented by: Charles Roberts, Gilbane Building Company Project Manager

Application was continued from the December 2006 agenda so applicant could address questions raised by neighbors regarding use of the fields and lighting.

Town Witness

Al Ranaldi, Town Planner

He spoke with the Parks & Recreation Director and the school. It was determined that sports would end by 9:30 pm and the lights would be shut off completely by 10:00 pm. The proposed lights will come with a remote allowing them to be turned off in case a game is cancelled and all lighting will be directed downwards towards the the playing fields. The town has taken every precaution and addressed neighbor concerns. The town is upgrading their parks and the Parks & Recreation department is willing to schedule use of the fields so to address concerns. The town has agreed to turn off all lights by 10:00 pm. There will be no bleachers at the field because the town wants to keep the area clear. Any complaints from neighbors will be addressed by Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official.

Chairman Arsenault read into the record Planning Board recommendation:

This application was continued by the Zoning Board in order for the applicant to consult with the neighbors. New information or plans were not submitted to the Technical Review Committee or the Planning Board. Therefore, the Planning Board could not render a recommendation.

Opposed:

Christine Giroux, 9 Tattersall Drive, Lincoln, RI

She stated when the town originally had discussions with residents there was a verbal agreement that there would be no bleachers or lights at the new school. Her house is 40 feet away and does not want her quality of life threatened. Now the town wants to install lights that will reflect in her back yard. Evening games will create noise at night.

Chairman informed her that the only issue before the Board this evening is for the lights. She thought the meeting this evening was to find out if anything was said about the lights during the meeting with neighbors. This is an intrusion into her lifestyle.

Chairman asked Mr. Ranaldi what was discussed with the neighbors when the school was being planned. Mr. Ranaldi replied that at the initial meeting three years ago no lights were planned for the school. The site plan shows that Ms. Giroux's house is more than 200 feet from the field. Wherever the school places the lights would not impact her property. Attorney Krieger informed the Board that there is noise ordinance in the town and once the lights are turned off

attendees would be dispersed from the field. Member Russo asked what exactly was said at the public meetings. Mr. Roberts stated there were no minutes available of the public meetings and he was not sure what was said.

Motion made by Member Rao to approve height relief for two 50 foot poles and four 70 foot poles with a condition that there will be 0% illumination by 10:00 pm at the site. She further stated:

- The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not due to the general characteristics of the surrounding area and is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant.
- The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.
- The granting of this variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.
- The relief requested is the least relief necessary.
- The hardship amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, meaning there is no other reasonable alternative to enjoy a legally permitted beneficial use of the property

Motion seconded by Member Russo. Motion carried with a 4-1 vote with Members Karempetsos, Russo, Rao and Arsenault voting aye and Member Halmi voting nay.

Wojciech Marczak, 43 Mark Drive, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for rear yard setback for the construction of an addition.

AP 19, Lot 87 Zoned: RS 20

Represented by: Piotr Marcak, Son

Russell Hervieux, Zoning Official informed the Board that there was a problem with notice on this application. He contacted applicant and informed them that notice to Luis Paolino was returned. Applicant went to Mr. Paolino and had him sign an affidavit stating he received notice and had no objection to the application. Town Solicitor Mark Krieger read the affidavit into the record and noted the date on the affidavit was January 5, 2007 instead of February 5, 2007. Applicant replied it was a typographical error. Applicant stated she witnessed Mr. Paolino sign the affidavit.

Applicant would like an 11 foot addition to existing kitchen area which has a cathedral ceiling. Wants a larger kitchen to entertain family. Cannot provide Board with floor plans because they have not been drawn pending approval of the application. The addition will be adjacent to the kitchen area. They built the house and want to stay at this location. Would need to remove part of an existing deck and exterior of the addition will match existing house. There will be no exterior lighting. House was built in 1991.

Chairman Arsenault informed applicant that the Board would like to see a floor plan of the inside of the house and the proposed addition. Could applicant return for the March meeting with the requested documents and she replied yes.

Motion made by Member Rao to continue the application to the March agenda. Motion seconded by Member Halmi. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Motion made by Member Russo to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Member Rao. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Ghislaine D. Therien

Recording Secretary